JUL 3 0 1984

- 1 -

WAN10,11,16 Rawon Fo 623-55

Distribution: WM sf (A0294) WMGT rf

NMSS rf RBrowning

DMattson MKnapp

PJustus

MBlackford & rf

LPDR (B, N, S)

DLoosley, PSB

MBell

426.1/A0294/MB/84/07/20/0

Dr. Dae Chung Staff Scientist Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Livermore, California 94550

Dear Dr. Chung:

In accordance with Task 2 of Contract No. A0294, I request that you initiate a limited review of the following sections of the draft environmental assessments for the Nevada Nuclear Waste Storage Investigations (NNWSI) Project and the Basalt Waste Isolation Project (BWIP)²:

3.1.1 - 3.1.2 (NNWSI only), 3.1 - 3.2 (BWIP only) 4.1.1 5.2.1, - 5.2.2 (NNWSI only), 5.2.1.1 - 5.2.1.2 (BWIP only) 6.2.1.6, 6.3.1 - 6.3.4, 6.4.2

The review should be limited because it is anticipated that a subsequent set of drafts will be issued next month with significant revisions, particularly to Chapters 4 and 5. The purpose of the review at this time is to become familiar with the form of the document and to identify those sections which contain information on the geology in general and on the seismo-tectonic aspects in particular. The review should concentrate on Chapters 3 and 6 with a lesser amount of time devoted to Chapters 4 and 5. The following is a summary of the manner in which the NRC anticipates these documents will be reviewed:

- Chapter 3 The general site description is to be reviewed to determine if, based on available data, the seismo-logical and tectonic elements in the geologic description presented are correct, complete and justified.
- Chapter 6 With emphasis on, but not limited to 10 CFR 960.4-2-7, and 960.5-2-11, the review of the suitability of the sites should focus on both known and suspected features within the geological setting which could affect waste isolation.
- 1 U.S. Department of Energy, June 1,1984, "Nevada Nuclear Waste Storage Investigations Project, NWPA Environmental Assessment", Draft
- 2 U.S. Department of Energy, July 1984, Untitled Chapters 2-6, Glossary, and Reference

*******	8409060107 PDR WMRES E A-0294		:	 	··`
84/07/30		:		**********	

426.1/A0294/MB/84/07/20/0

- 2 -

- Chapter 5 The environmental effects of the repository related to geology are to be reviewed to determine if, based on professional judgment, the information presented is consistent with the siting guidelines.
- Chapter 4 The site characterization activities and the effects of such activities are to be reviewed to determine if the tasks outlined are justified and suitable to fill the information gaps in the seismological and tectonic elements of the geologic data presented.

Detailed requirements for this review are presented in Table 2 of the EA review plan.

The final product should be in the form of a letter report addressing each of the sites individually. The form of the comments is very important. The following types of comments are acceptable:

- a) The interpretation disagrees with other published literature including information presented in other sections of the EA.-cite references (This is primarily Chapter 3)
- b) The data allows a different interpretation--give reason and cite references if applicable (This is primarily Chapter 3)
- c) Not enough information was presented to allow the reader to determine how the conclusions were reached.
- d) The information presented in Chapter 3 and the information in a, b, and c above will allow a different interpretation as to how the guidelines are met, i.e., groundwater travel time to the accessible environment is given as XXX years, however, if the fault postulated by XXX is present, a much shorter travel time is possible. (Primarily Chapter 6)
- e) The environmental effects have (possibly) been misstated.
- f) The tasks outlined in Chapter 4 (probably) will not provide the required data.

:

:

107 100

:

:

:

426.1/A0294/MB/84/07/20/0

- 3 -

In all cases, a comment by itself is not acceptable. Either a reference or a reason must be given for each comment. In addition, primary emphasis should be given to comments which deal with public health and safety. Additional guidance is given in Section 4.2 of the EA review plan while Table 7 presents the exact required format.

At this time, no more than 1 man week per site should be necessary for this review with 1 additional man week for coordination, editing, and typing of the final letter report. Because of time limitations, I request that LLNL complete and submit the letter report four (4) weeks after the receipt of this task.

The action taken by this letter is considered to be within the scope of the current contract (A-0294). No change to costs or delivery of contracted products is authorized. Please notify me immediately if you believe this leter would result in changes to costs or delivery of contract products.

I will be pleased to answer any questions on this task and I can be reached at 427-4597 FTS.

Michael E. Blackford, Project Manager Geology/Geophysics Section Geotechnical Branch Division of Waste Management Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards

MBlackford PJustus DLoosley 184/07/30 84/07/30 84/07/